DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 893 SO 015 697

AUTHOR	Mason, Mary; Chew, Martha
TITLE	Two Studies: A Feminist Approach to Teaching Non-Traditional Students. Working Paper No. 123.
INSTITUTION	Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY	Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	24p.; For related documents on women and university courses, see SO 015 695-699.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($3.00).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Course Content; Course Descriptions; Curriculum Development; Displaced Homemakers; Education Work Relationship; *English Curriculum; Females; Feminism; Higher Education; *Humanities Instruction; Minority Groups; *Nontraditional Students; *Professional Education; *Reentry Students; *Relevance (Education); Student Educational Objectives; Student Needs; Womens Education; Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

Two papers explore feminist strategies for adapting traditional humanities and English courses to the needs of nontraditional and professional students. The first paper, "A Feminist Approach to Teaching Humanities to Non-Traditional Students" by Mary Mason, discusses a "public humanities" course, that is, a course for returning students who hope to find practical applications for their academic experiences. This course, entitled "Women in Transition," applied strategies originally developed in women's studies programs to provide a meaningful humanities course for women reentering the work force. Goals established for the course were to use literature and art to help women identify common problems, develop a sense of community, and develop a better sense of self and capacity for decision-making. Innovative strategies borrowed from women's studies courses included interdisciplinary content, peer teaching, and diversity of instructional methods and materials. The second paper, "A Feminist Perspective on English for Professional Students" by Martha Chew, discusses the necessity of adapting required English courses to meet the needs of professional students. The problems of student and faculty suspicion of humanities as too radical, student lack of interest in content, and student attitudes that such courses are not serious or valuable are addressed. One such attempt to offer an English requirement with personal relevance for professional students was a course developed around the theme of survival. This course attempted to introduce students to real human problems through the use of the literature by women and minorities rather than the accepted classics of male authors. (LP)

ED244893

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary G. Mason

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Feminist Approach

to Teaching Humanities to Non-Traditional Students

Mary G. Mason

The new scholarship on women challenges the scope, materials, and pedagogy of our disciplines in the humanities, but it also revitalizes them, and can help to create a much-needed bridge from the academic institution to the public sector. More and more of us, as trained humanists, have been called upon to teach non-traditional students--students of all ages who often expect that their "academic" experience will have some practical application to their lives. These students want to relate the humanities to their work life, community life and family life, and they challenge us to use the basic skills of our particular discipline, as well as its insights into human experience, to create a "Public Humanities." I have found that the changes that I make in teaching my discipline of literature for the Public Humanities are often the same ones that women scholars have adopted in teaching Women's Studies.[1] My experience in developing and teaching an interdisciplinary public humanities program for women will illustrate parallels between the new feminist teaching experience and the experience of those of us--an artist/historian, an historian of Women's History, a literary critic, and a sociologist--who taught a program, "Women in Transition: Perspectives on Choice," at Emmanuel College.

With the help of a grant from the Massachusetts Foundation for Humanities and Public Policy, I developed a program for "displaced homemakers" (women who are forcibly entering the job market from the home due to widowhood, divorce, or financial crisis), which used women's experience as represented in art, literature, and social history to illuminate the problems and the

1

choices women face in making a transition from the home to the workplace. I had researched the need for a Women's Resource Center at Emmanuel College, a center that would provide workshops, career counseling and other kinds of resources for urban women living in the inner city of Boston as well as for the alumnae of the college. The program was intended to initiate the opening of the Center. Those of us planning and teaching the eight weekly three-hour sessions were energized by the intellectual excitement as well as the personal satisfaction that was expressed by the participants throughout the program. As a result of the eight weeks, the Women's Resource Center has started a number of workshops and it has begun other programs that use the resources of a liberal arts institution to connect with the community of non-academic women in the Boston area.

The underlying assumption of the program was a feminist one and challenged the habit of private self-exploration inherent in much of the Humanities, particularly in the discipline of literature. We operated on the assumption that the integrity of the individual, freed from the distortion of stereotyping and social role assignment, can best be protected and transformed by identifying with a larger community and a wider view of human experience. The program was structured so that the individual participant could move through fields of consciousness--a series of concentric circles where the center is the self--toward the experience and consciousness of all women. They learned about the experience of other women--from the past and present and from different races and classes--through the particularity of the humanities. From this broad perspective, they were able to achieve three practical goals that we had set for them: first, to name and identify problems they had

in common; second, to reduce their state of isolation by developing a sense of community; and third, as a result of the other two, to have a better sense of themselves and be better prepared to make practical decisions and choices.[2] Unlike most of the "displaced homemaker" programs--federally and state funded --which have primarily focussed on crisis intervention and short term goals, such as the development of basic job skills, our program attempted to develop long range solutions.

What were some of the changes that we made in the scope and techniques and materials of our teaching? First of all, we took advantage of non-traditional teaching methods, particularly as developed in feminist learning situations, where the subject/object orientation between instructor and student is broken down. As Nancy Porter noted in her article in Women's Studies Quarterly, Women's Studies has revitalized the notion that learning can be based on dialogue and the participation of a community of learners, including both teachers and students.[3] She argues that those of us trained in the "new criticism" were taught to expect that the subject matter of teaching could be removed from a personal and social context and thus could transcend mere worldly issues in order to arrive at "Truth." Clearly in teaching public humanities, and particularly in teaching the women in this program, such a pedagogy, disassociated from the immediate social context of daily lives, would be of little value. Our sessions were all part of a process of learning, shared by all of us. The participants learned from one another as well as from the "discussion leaders." In fact, they helped to structure the curriculum. We asked them to identify some of the issues that concerned them in the introductory session after they had seen the film

about World War II women war workers, "The Life and Times of Rosie the Riveter." In the discussion of the film they named three main issues that they had perceived from the stories of the women and that they felt pertained to their own lives: the "double bind" of a commitment to both work and family and the personal guilt and conflicts it causes; the socialization and manipulation of women in society and the need for a strong sense of self to avoid the limitations of stereotyping; finally, the separation of women from each other and the need for community and for bonding among women of different races and class. These concerns, many of which we had anticipated in planning the program, were subsequently explored in the next seven sessions.

The diversity of the method of participation was also non-traditional. The participants discussed literature, films and art exhibits, listened to guest artists and speakers, developed their own work history in relation to their own family history, and wrote a collective book of interviews and memory pieces about their own generations of women. At the end of the program, they were given a chance to reassess their materials and to add insights and comments about the process we had all experienced. One woman wrote in her comments, "We walked in as strangers and came out comrades, bound by our shared experience." Another participant, commenting on the practical outcome for her, wrote, "Eight weeks ago I had my goals set on one thing. To-day I am able and willing to try others."

Different kinds of discourse were used in the sessions, some analytical and others, narrative or descriptive. For instance, the discussion of the literary text of Tillie Olsen's "I Stand Here Ironing," followed by a film

presentation of the same story, gave the groups an opportunity to analyze the different insights of the two art forms but it also gave them a chance to describe personal reactions to the fictional situations or to narrate personal life experiences relevant to the subject of conflicting commitments of a working mother. We moved back and forth in our discourse from the autobiographical/personal to the historical/public but always outward to a broader sense of experience.

In addition to innovative pedagogy, the program used diverse materials, reflecting a freedom from formalism that is characteristic of the new scholarship on women. Following the example of recent scholars of Women's History, we "redefined the categories" of history and used new topics that related to the particular issues of the group:[4] for instance, the contrast between public and private spheres in the lives of women; women's work and the sexual division of labor; the contrast of women's isolation with her participation in the community; the relationship of women's private life histories with collective social patterns of women, and so on. The organization of our materials on a non-hierarchical and non-linear basis enabled us to present historical, factual material in a mode applicable to the personal issues that the participants brought to the program.

In literature and art we used materials that might fall outside the serious aesthetic consideration in traditional humanities curriculum. For instance, our art exhibits used crafts, such as quilts, ceramics, and weaving, as well as art from the traditional genres of painting, sculpture and drawing. A woman artist showed slides of her paintings which illustrated her artistic development but which also showed the stages of her life as a

woman. Literature was represented by traditional genres, such as stories, essays, and poetry, but also by non-traditional forms, such as journals and documents from personal records. The focus of the discussion was not so much on the formal definitions of genres as on the unifying themes and perceptions that the works suggested. The themes, themselves, were transformations of the traditional male themes of literature, such as initiation, the lonely quest, conflicting loyalties, and the pursuit of honor. Transformed, these themes became the little recognized initiation rites of the women's life cycle (often reflected by modern women poets), the loneliness and isolation in the home of women from other women (seen so often in the writings of American women authors from Edith Wharton and Willa Cather to Grace Paley), the conflicts of domestic and personal goals in a woman's life and her "guarding" of what is personally meaningful to others as a man guards his honor (as seen, for instance, in the story "Everyday Use" by Alice Walker). Finally, the writings of the participants themselves--interviews, memory pieces, poetry and letters about an older woman relative who was important in their lives--was edited and shaped by the group itself into a book, "Portraits: Generations of Women," illustrated with family photographs and memorabilia collected by the writers. This collection of portraits of mothers, grandmothers, and aunts not only showed important life patterns of one generation of women and how they influenced another generation, but it also gave the group an opportunity to create a work of art of their own.[5]

The interdisciplinary materials of the program, consistent with the approach of Women's Studies, were particularly helpful in connecting the

personal issues and concerns of the participants with the collective patterns of other women. For instance, a question of self-devaluation--Am I worth anything outside the home?--shared by many of the women, was explored in one session through a combination of interdisciplinary readings, a lecture, a film, and an exhibit. A presentation at the beginning of the session discussed the history of the changes in the role of women's lives and the reasons why their work and creative contributions in the domestic sphere became devalued. Documentary readings, as well as examples of writings, reflecting private and public roles of women in the past, were discussed. Contemporary stories and essays explored the subject of the lost creativity in women's lives and its reclamation in their domestic art forms. A recent film on women quilt-makers gave examples of a traditional women's art form and was followed by an exhibition of quilts brought to the program by an older woman, who had organized a quilt-making group of her own. Two of the sub-themes that emerged from this session included the uniqueness and importance of women's friendships and the diversity and dynamics of women's communities. One participant described her own identification with a community of women when she said, "I have greater respect for all women (women in the past, present and future), after listening, reading, observing and sharing with the women in the course."

The expression of satisfaction of the participants and their more formal evaluation of what had happened during the eight-week program encouraged us to feel that we had accomplished the goals we had set for the program. One woman summed up her experience when she said, "The course changed my perspective on myself, my history and my future." Another, speaking of the

more concrete results of her experience, said, "Before the course I had no specific plans. Now I've made plans."

The teaching of Public Humanities, like the teaching of Women's Studies, is a transformative experience but it demands innovation and a fresh adaptation of the methods and materials of the Humanities. The changes are rewarding not only because they help to fill the programs in the academic institutions in which we teach, but also because they offer the humanist a chance to feel a part of the important social and political issues of the day.

Footnotes

[1]For the purposes of this essay I have used the categories discussed by Sheila Ruth in her discussion of feminist learning situations, in particular the scope, materials, and pedagogy characteristic of Women's Studies. Since my program was not part of a Women's Studies program, I will usually refer to my frame of reference as "The study of women." See "Introduction" to Issues in Feminism: A First Course in Women's Studies (Houghton Mifflin: 1980), pp. 1-18.

[2]Joan I. Roberts in "Beyond Intellectual Sexism" discusses the transformative effect of Women's Studies on students after they have faced the recognition of sexism: "But as this occurs, a more important transformation engages them in a new sense of self and a new feeling of future possibilities." See Issues in Feminism, p. 23.

[3]Nancy Porter, "Liberating Teaching" in Women's Studies Quarterly, X.4 (Winter, 1982), pp. 19-25.

[4]Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz, "Restoring Women to History," in Issues of Feminism, pp. 404-411.

[5]Lillian Robinson, author of Sex, Class and Culture, in her discussion (the Mellon Semirar on integrating women's scholarship into the Humanities, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, 1982-83) about the reevaluation of the canon in literature, raised the question of how we should arrive at aesthetic criteria for works by women that would not ordinarily be considered as works of art or might be considered as "popular art."

A Feminist Perspective on English for Professional Students

Martha Chew

I teach English in the Liberal Arts Department of a professional school, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences. My college has a five-year curriculum that leads to a B.S. in Pharmacy, and the Liberal Arts Department plays an important role in this curriculum. In addition to the professional courses, students must take eight quarter hours of Freshman English and seventeen quarter hours of humanities courses. My purpose in this paper is to discuss the importance of introducing feminist perspectives in humanities courses designed for such professional students.

At my school, as at many professional schools, English and other humanities courses are in theory like required humanities courses anywhere. They are not intended to provide a humanities perspective on pharmacy or other health sciences, but rather are intended to be "pure" humanities that offer an introduction to the humanities disciplines. In practice, the "underdog" status of the humanities at my college has influenced the way we think about our courses and, consequently, the way the English curriculum has evolved. My experience does not enable me to generalize about how English is taught to all professional majors. However, my conversations with humanities colleagues at medical, business, and other professional schools have led me to believe that our teaching experiences share some important similarities as a result of the professional environment in which we teach and that our humanities courses are, as a whole, different from humanities courses at the liberal arts colleges with which I am familiar.

I think that it is possible to say that the discipline of English in small professional schools such as mine differs in some important ways from the discipline of English in other academic settings and perhaps should be regarded as a subset of that discipline.

Those of us who are engaged in the theoretical work of transforming the college English curriculum[1] are aware of the narrowness of the traditional concept of the discipline of English and the extent to which that concept must change in order for the English curriculum to reflect the reality of human experience. The universities have, as Gloria Bowles emphasizes in her argument for Women's Studies, created an "unreal world" in excluding women and minorities from the curriculum: "As it exists now, society's institution, the university, lies outside society; since it has chosen not to study women and ethnic minorities, who are so obviously a part of the real world, the university has built an unreal world."[2] In discussing the need to transform the humanities curriculum, philosopher Elizabeth Minnich has pointed out the irony in the fact that the field of study that is intended to engage us in "what is human in all of us, excludes most of us."[3] In order for English to be a humanities discipline in the sense that the word "humanities" suggests, English courses must teach works of literature that are concerned, not simply with white male thought and relations, but with <u>human</u> thought and relations. Too often, English courses are limited to works of literature that have been labeled "classics" largely because they reflect the ideology of the dominant culture. The process is a circular one: "great" literary works are considered "great" because they fit a definition of literary excellence skewed toward white male values. For example, Paul Lauter's study, "Caste, Race and Gender

in the Shaping of the American Literary Canon: A Case Study from the Twenties," describes the process by which the canon in American literature was formed by the tastes of white male Protestant clergy in New England in the 1920's.[4] We are aware, then, that in order to transform the English curriculum we must not simply add books to traditional reading lists but must engage in an act of "re-vision"[5] that begins by recognizing that human beings previously regarded as "the other" are actually fifty percent of the world's population. The process of re-definition that naturally ensues is a radical one: we must re-define literature; re-define literary excellence; re-define literary forms (for example, the traditional concept of genres must be expanded to include blending of genres and other forms); and re-define the criteria by which we judge the importance of themes previously not considered central to literary study, such as lesbianism and women's friendships.

The same re-definition process is necessary to transform the English curriculum in professional schools. Here, however, the re-definition process involves more radical changes than would perhaps be expected by those whose academic experience lies in liberal arts colleges because of the specific ways in which the professional environment has shaped the English curriculum.

The professional school environment is characterized, first, by the students' lack of interest in the humanities. Most of our students do not want, at least initially, to take humanities courses. Some of them admit that they have chosen a pharmacy major in part because they did not like literature and other humanities subjects in high school.

Second, students, as well as nonhumanities faculty and administrators, quite naturally tend to look at the pharmacy-related courses as the "serious"

courses. These courses are the reason the school exists and the reason the students are there. They regard humanities courses as merely the required pre-pharmacy courses. Students see humanities courses as less important, not only because of the nonpharmacy content of the courses, but also because of the way the courses are taught. David Thomasma, in discussing his experience teaching humanities to health professionals at Loyola of Chicago and the University of Tennessee, observes that "formats that work in a self-reflective environment do not work in a pragmatic, memory- and responsibility-oriented curriculum."[6] Certainly this has been my experience at the college where I teach. Pedagogical standards are set by the professional courses, and it is inevitable that humanities courses will be compared unfavorably with courses that use lecture formats exclusively and that call for memorization of data to be used in real life work situations. Moreover, professional courses, like some science courses, tend to promulgate the myth of scientific "objectivity," and students often feel that humanities courses (as well as those science courses that deal with the subjectivity of process and theories) lack standards.

Third, courses that encourage students to question the status quo--and most humanities courses do that when they teach students to think critically--are regarded with more suspicion at professional schools than at other schools. It is not surprising that the climate at a professional school would be an unfavorable one for such questioning of the established system, for the established system is what, in large part, gives the so-called professions their power. It is also not surprising that the professional school climate is one that is hostile to women's issues, in particular. Our students, like

most professional students, are training to enter a field that is white-male dominated and white-male run, and the values of that field determine the climate at our college, even though 50 percent of the students are women, almost 40 percent are international students, and a little over ten percent are minorities. Although the passage of Title IX in 1972 has resulted in a dramatic increase in the enrollment of women in professional schools--136 percent in pharmacy, 218 percent in medicine, 317 percent in veterinary medicine, and 832 percent in dentistry[7]--these fields have been slower to accept women in their job ranks. My experience confirms Rose Kamel's observation, in her article in College English last year, about teaching Women's Studies at Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science: "in a corporate professional school, to question any patriarchal system is to become suspect."

In response to these attitudes towards humanities courses, those of us who teach humanities courses have reacted in a number of ways. I feel pressured to make my courses more appealing to students by watering them down, or, in some cases, giving them pharmacy-related themes. Yet, a more subtle, and therefore more insidious, pressure is the pressure to win respect for my courses by making them appear "data based." There is also the temptation to give my courses "scientific objectivity" by presenting arbitrary standards of literary excellence as absolute standards. And finally, there is a feeling that I will win points with the students and professional faculty by teaching works that have traditionally been regarded as classics.

A few years ago I helped to design a humanities display for our college open house. Afterwards, a humanities colleague asked to borrow a photograph of Robert Frost used in the display so that he could feature it in a pharmacy

journal ad promoting the humanities curriculum at our school. He did not want to use the Angela Davis photograph, or to use the two photographs together, as a way of suggesting the excellence of our American literature courses; he felt that Robert Frost was our department's best selling point, presumably because pharmacists would recognize him as a well-known American poet and would, thanks to the sanitization of his poetry in the media view of him, consider him an all-American poet. He was right about the ad. My point is that this attitude of what will "sell" invariably carries over into our classes, and we constantly have to resist the pressure to legitimize our courses in the eyes of nonhumanities students and faculty by teaching works that fit their definition of literary excellence. As a result of these pressures, the English curriculum in my school is more white-male oriented, both in methodology and in content, than English curricula elsewhere, and I suspect that this is the case in other small professional schools.

When the English curriculum has been shaped by the professional school environment in these ways, the re-definition process necessary to transform the curriculum involves more radical changes than it involves for English courses in liberal arts colleges. Because of the suspicion of humanities courses as being too radical, the feeling that they aren't serious courses, and the lack of interest in them, transforming English at schools like mine has a longer way to go and heavier odds with which to contend. Yet, when I look at the special situation of our students, I see a situation that on many levels <u>demands</u> this very transformation of the curriculum.

On the first level, that of the students' professional training, it is obvious that a curriculum which excludes women and minorities, or includes

them only on a token basis, gives students a distorted view of reality.

Nevertheless, the situation of professional students calls for transforming English on much more important grounds than that of the students' professional training. In one respect, the students' lack of interest in and lack of respect for humanities courses are valid responses. Many of my students work part time and many of them commute (sometimes from as far away as New Hampshire). Tuition money often represents financial hardship for them or their parents. They are making this expenditure of time and money to take courses that are essential to their lives, courses that mean the difference between a job working in the stock room of a pharmacy at the minimum wage and a starting salary of over $30,000 a year in a professional setting. Humanities courses divert money and time from the courses that will prepare them to earn a living. It is only a privileged view of human experience that can ignore economic reality and say that students "should" or "ought to" take nonpractical courses. My field is overrun with senior scholars who are bemoaning the practicality of today's students and the resulting decrease in English majors; such scholars are often protected from everyday realities by wives and daughters, or female graduate students and secretarial and clerical workers. If I were retraining to make my living in a nonhumanities field, I would resent, and rightly so, any required humanities courses that would take time away from the courses preparing me to earn a living if those humanities courses were not useful to me in some practical way.

English courses should meet students' needs for practical, relevant courses on a more organic level than simply by aping the data-based format and the "objectivity" of professional courses, or by teaching literary works

that professionals will recognize as "classics." Looking at the ways that the English curriculum can be made relevant to professional students does not mean making the curriculum superficially relevant to the work they are being trained to do but rather making the curriculum relevant to their experience as human beings.

The test of whether or not a humanities curriculum is relevant to people's lives is whether or not it has any interest or practical value for people who are not in the privileged position of being able to spend time and money majoring in the humanities. It is human beings, not humanities majors, who are the test of how well the humanities curriculum meets human needs.

For me, recognizing the need of professional students for an English curriculum that has practical relevance to their lives was the first step in recognizing that the traditional curriculum is not relevant, except on a very limited level, to anyone's human needs. The attitudes of my nonhumanities students forced me to examine my discipline and to justify it to them and to me. In order to do so, I have had to re-think and re-define my concept of the value of literature. Teaching in a professional school has rescued me from my blind acceptance of a curriculum that ignored the reality of my own experience. Introducing my students to literature and a theory of literature that speaks to the reality of their experience as human beings has enabled me to recognize the validity of my experience and to look at literature in terms of how it speaks to my experience.

Transforming my English courses has revitalized them, largely because of the emphasis that feminist theory puts on personal experience and also because of the cross-disciplinary approach necessary if literature is to be

seen in relation to our lives. This past year I organized my American literature course around the theme of "survival experiences"; we began with Leslie Silko's Ceremony and ended with Alice Walker's first short story collection, In Love and Trouble: Stories of Black Women. I chose the theme of "survival experiences" because it provided a structure for the course in which the true significance of literature by women and minorities could be illuminated, as opposed to the type of course structure that simply adds a woman and a minority to a traditional reading list and then judges these works by the narrow and biased standards set up by the list. However, I also chose the survival theme because I wanted the literature we read to be relevant to the students' lives, to be useful to them as human beings. My students talked and wrote about how their ideas about survival had been shaped by the literature; they explored the complexity of what survival means, especially in situations where emotional and physical survival are at odds. Furthermore, they compared and contrasted survival strategies of the literary characters with strategies they themselves had used or had seen used by other people. As the students talked about the readings in terms of their own lives, what they learned from the literature, and what they valued about it began to give me a new perspective on literature. For example, in re-reading Frederick Douglass' Narrative in preparation for class, I was struck by his saying of The Columbian Orator, a book that he had read when he was twelve and that had occasioned a turning point in his flight to freedom, that "The reading of these documents enabled me to utter my thoughts and to meet the arguments brought forth to justify slavery."[9] I thought that if The Columbian Orator could reinforce Douglass in his ability to conceive of himself as a free human being, it set up one definition of

good literature for me. This, in turn, made me remember Linda Nochlin's exploration of what standards of excellence mean in art.[10]

My interest in designing a curriculum that is relevant to students' lives led me to prepare a bibliography of American literature readings for Mary Mason's "Women in Transition" program at Emmanuel College last fall. That, in turn, has encouraged me to design with a colleague a series of women in literature programs for neighborhood women in public libraries, which is being sponsored by The Massachusetts Foundation for the Humanities and Public Policy. We are using recent stories and novels by women that deal with the theme of women's body image and self-esteem. We picked this theme because of its relevance to our lives as women and to the lives of the women who will participate in the programs. Recently, a male literary scholar praised our project but expressed the fear that our personal approach to literature will result in our program participants developing a new attitude toward literature. "I count it a...serious risk," he said, "that these women will ever after see literature as an intense experience of that kind, which would make the bulk of literature uninteresting to them." By "the bulk of literature" he meant the relatively small number of works in the traditional canon, not the large body of feminist writings that have the potential for transforming the curriculum. Moreover, his attitude toward "the bulk of literature" or literary works in the traditional canon assumed a theory of literary criticism that does not encourage readers "to see literature as an intense experience of that kind." His apprehension has strengthened my belief in the need to introduce nonhumanities majors and the nonacademic public to transformed English courses that will broaden their concept of literature and enable them to see it as personally relevant to their lives.

Footnotes

[1]Through our participation in institutes and seminars such as The Feminist Press Institute at Yale on Reconstructing American Literature and the Mellon Seminars at the Wellesley Center for Research on Women.

[2]Gloria Bowles, "Is Women's Studies an Academic Discipline?," Theories of Women's Studies, ed. Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 33.

[3]Elizabeth Minnich, keynote address, "Equity and Excellence" Conference, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, March 17, 18, quoted in Branches: Newsletter of the Duke-UNC Women's Studies Research Center, spring, 1983, p. 1.

[4]Paul Lauter, "Caste, Race and Gender in the Shaping of the American Literary Canon: A Case Study from the Twenties," an unpublished paper.

[5]I have borrowed "re-vision" from Adrienne Rich's "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-vision," On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978 (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1979).

[6]David C. Thomasma, "Humanities Training for Health Professionals," Mobius: A Journal for Continuing Education Professionals in Health Sciences and Health Policy 2 (July 1982), 76.

[7]Figures on women in professional schools are given in The Final Report of the AphA Task Force on Women in Pharmacy (Washington, D.C.: American Pharmaceutical Association, 1981), p. 14, and "Frontlines," Savvy (July 1983), p. 13.

[8]Rose Kamel, "Teaching Women's Studies at Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science," College English (Nov. 1982).

[9]Frederick Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave (New York: New American Library, 1968), p. 54.

[10]Linda Nochlin, "Why have there been no feminist artists, Toward a Juster Vision: How feminists can change our way of looking at art history." "In Feminist Collage: Educating Women in Visual Arts. Judy Loed, ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1979), pp. 3-13.